

## Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 03362 201702Z

43  
ACTION EUR-08

INFO OCT-01 SS-14 ISO-00 NSC-05 NSCE-00 INR-05 PM-03 SP-02

SAM-01 L-01 SSO-00 INRE-00 EURE-00 /040 W  
----- 115659

O R 201618Z JUN 75  
FM USMISSION NATO  
TO SECSTATE IMMEDIATE 2373  
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE ZFF-4  
INFORUFHOL/AMEMBASSY BONN 6241  
AMEMBASSY OTTAWA  
CINCLANT  
CINCUSAFE  
CINCUSAREUR  
USCINCEUR  
USDOCOSOUTH  
USLOSACLANT  
USNMR SHAPE

C O N F I D E N T I A L USNATO 3362

LIMDIS  
E.O. 11652: GDS  
TAGS: MPOL, NATO, CA  
SUBJECT: CANADIAN DEFENSE STRUCTURE REVIEW

REF: USNATO 3323

1. DURING STAFFING OF US POSITION ON CANADIAN DEFENSE STRUCTURE  
REVIEW (REFTEL), WASHINGTON MAY WISH TO CONSIDER FOLLOWING POINTS  
CONCERNING CANADIAN CONSULTATION PAPER AND ON MORE GENERAL SUBJECT  
OF CANADA'S CONTRIBUTION TO EUROPEAN DEFENSE:

A. CANADIAN CONSULTATION PAPER ADDRESSES ONLY REPEAT ONLY CANADIAN  
STANDING FORCES LOCATED IN EUROPE. AT LEAST THREE OTHER ELEMENTS OF  
CANADAIN FORCES ARE POLITICALLY AND MILITARILY IMPORTANT TO EUROPEAN  
DEFENSE: REINFORCEMENT LAND AND AIR FORCES EARMARKED FOR  
NATO; MARITIME FORCES COMMITTED TO ATLANTIC SEALANCE DEFENSE;  
AND OTHER NATIONAL FORCES WHICH COULD BE USED FOR EUROPEAN  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 03362 201702Z

DEFENSE SHOULD CIRCUMSTANCES DEMAND. A CHOICE OF ANY OF THE  
THREE CANADIAN OPTIONS, OR VARIATION THEREOF, TO STANDING  
FORCES IN EUROPE WOULD ENTAIL RAMIFICATIONSFOR REINFORCEMENT/  
AUGMENTATION FORCES, MARITIME FORCES AND OTHER FORCES FOR

NATO. WE MUST LEAVE IT TO THE CANADIAN SIDE TO EXPLAIN THESE RAMIFICATIONS; NO FINAL US RESPONSE SHOULD BE GIVEN TO THE CANADIAN PAPER IN THE ABSENCE OF SUCH EXPLANATION.

B. NO COST DATA, AND ONLY SCANTY MANPOWER DATA, HAVE BEEN PROVIDED. OUR INFORMAL REQUEST FOR SUCH DATA FROM CANADIAN DELEGATION TO NATO HAVE BEEN UNPRODUCTIVE. IT SEEMS TO US THAT ALLIED POLITICAL REACTION TO THE REVIEW AS A WHOLE IS SURE TO BE INFLUEENDED SOMEWHAT BY WHETHER CANADA PLANS TO REVERSE ITS DOWNWARD DEFENSE SPEDING TRENDS AND, AS A RICH COUNTRY, IMPROVE ITS STANDING IN THE TRADITIONAL MANEY AND MANPOWER MEASURES OF THE DEFENSE EFFORT. WE BELIEVE US SHOULD MAKE THIS POINT CLEARLY DURING THE COURSE OF CONSULTATIONS WITH THE CANADIANS.

C. IT ALSO APPEARS TO US FROM EXAMINATION OF CANADIAN OPTION PAPER (REFTEL) THAT OTTAWA IS LOOKING FOR A WAY TO AVOID HEAVY EXPENSE INVOLVED IN REPLACING BOTH CENTURION TANKS AND F-104 AIRCRAFT IN EUROPE. THIS IS NO DOUBT WHAT LIES BEHIND POSTULATING "ALL AIR" AND "ALL LAND" OPTIONS. APART FROM MILITARY EFFECTS WHICH CHOOSING ONE OF THESE OPTIONS WOULD HAVE, IT APPEARS TO US THAT POLITICAL EFFECTS WITHIN ALLIANCE (INCLUDING IMPACT ON MBFR NEGOTIATIONS) WOULD BE MOST UNFORTUNATE, AND WOULD INCREASE PRESSURES FOR SIMILAR ACTIONS BY OTHER NATIONS. WE SEE NO REPEAT NO REASON WHY CANADA SHOULD NOT LIVE UP TO ITS OBLIGATIONS AS A MEMBER OF NATO ALLIANCE AND, LIKE OTHER ALLIES, SOME OF WHOM ARE IN FAR LESS HEALTHY ECONOMIC STATE THAN CANADA, REPLACE ITS OBSOLESCEANT MILITARY EQUIPMENT IN TIMELY FASHION.

2. WE ARE AWAITING REPLY ON COMPOSITIONOF WASHINGTON TEAM FOR CONSULTATIONS, AND WOULD APPRECIATE ANSWER NOT LATER THAN OOB JUNE 24.

STREATOR

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptoning:** Z  
**Capture Date:** 18 AUG 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 20 JUN 1975  
**Decaption Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Decaption Note:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** GolinoFR  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1975NATO03362  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** 11652 GDS  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** NATO  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1975/newtext/t19750698/abbrzkqg.tel  
**Line Count:** 90  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** n/a  
**Original Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** LIMDIS  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 2  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** LIMDIS  
**Reference:** USNATO 3323  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** GolinoFR  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 30 APR 2003  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <30 APR 2003 by ElyME>; APPROVED <01 MAY 2003 by GolinoFR>  
**Review Markings:**

Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
06 JUL 2006

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** CANADIAN DEFENSE STRUCTURE REVIEW  
**TAGS:** MPOL, NATO, CA  
**To:** STATE  
**SECDEF ZFF-4**  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006